4: Petrullo E-9 (1935) 1937
SC13 Guajiro SC13

could not have paid the price in the first place, and besides B's family would have little to fear from them.

The father and maternal uncle of the slain man take the initiative in seeking payment which goes to the mother's family.

If A and B had been workmen or retainers of C, a cacique, and A's family could not have paid the price of composition, then C would have paid B's family and in compensation would have enslaved A and his family. Payment for killing a person is 10 mares, 50 to 100 sheep, and 10 steers.

Case IV: A was working for B. In the course of the work through no fault of B, A was hurt. B paid A's family for the injury. A's family took care of A.

Case V: A and B were working for C. Through accident B hurt A. B's family had to settle the injury with A's family. Had A been hurt in the course of the work without B acting as the instrument, then C, the employer, would have had to pay.

This case is similar to the one described by Simons. If A lends a horse to B and B is hurt through the instrumentality of the horse, A has to pay. If A gives rum to B and B injures C, A is held responsible.

Case VI: A wants to marry B. B or B's family reject his suit. A goes to B's rancho at night and commits suicide there. B's family has to pay A's family for the death of A, B being considered as the direct instrument that caused A's death.

Case VII: A injures or kills B, caught *in flagrante delicto* with A's wife. A has to pay B's family a price minus an amount considered fair value for the sexual privilege that B exercised on A's wife.

These illustrations point to the absolute nature of Guajiro law. No extenuating circumstances are allowed to enter into settlement of cases of battery or other trespass on the rights of an individual. The case is different in so far as public sympathy and moral censure or approbation are concerned. Furthermore, society as a whole takes no action in righting wrongs. The family of the injured person must seek composition, and if it is not powerful enough to demand a high price it has to be satisfied with a smaller one. Conversely, there is

S. Simmons K-5 (ca. 1882) 1885
SC13 Confiro SC13

In the following laws it must be borne in mind that it is not the injured individual that demands compensation, but his relations, usually on the mother's side as a rule. From this law arises the common error that the father is ignored; as will be seen further on, this is not the case. In compensation it is the caste that receives, and the caste is always the mother's side. For example, a Paulaina man marries an Urisea girl; the children are Urisean. If one of these now should kill an Epiayu, for example, the whole caste of Urisea is at war with all the Epiayan, unless the matter is amicably settled by paying blood-money.

Case No. 1. Personally inflicted wounds. If an Indian accidentally cuts himself, say with his own knife, breaks a limb, or otherwise does himself an injury, his family on the mother's side immediately demands blood-money. Being of their blood, he is not allowed to spill it without paying for it. The father's relations demand tear-money, not so much. Friends present demand compensation to repay their sorrow at seeing a friend in pain. If anybody present can seize the instrument that caused the accident it is appropriated. The pay is in ratio to the injury. A slightly cut finger is settled with a little Indian corn, a kid, or such trifle. A bad and copious at least a goat or a sheep, with other sundries. In all cases of compensation where the Indian has not the wherewith to satisfy his creditors, he goes round begging until it is obtained.

Case No. 2. Damage done by animals. Suppose an Indian borrows a mule or other animal, and is thrown by it, doing himself bodily injury, then his relations demand compensation from the lender, the argument being, had he not lent the animal the accident could not have happened. Should the beast belong to the thrown man himself, then he has to pay. Case of No. 1 in fact.

Case No. 3. General liability all round. This covers an enormous field. The most curious. Everybody selling rum or anything else is answerable for all the damage done by its instrumentality. Unfortunately this law is only, like many others, enforced when it is possible. As the traders know it very well, they never take rum into the interior for barter without being fully able to protect themselves. I was lent a servant as guide by a trader, who requested me not to let the man have any drink, for should anything happen to him he would be responsible to the family. Indians in employment receiving any damage the employer becomes liable; and so on. Wherever the Indian can only make the ghost of a claim he wants tear-money, blood-money, or some other money, and if not satisfied, helps himself with what he can lay his hands on.

Case No. 4. Mentioning names. This is very serious. The Indians object to have their true names mentioned, and demand heavy compensation in aggravated cases. They generally go by a Spanish name—José Antonio, Agustin, Vicente, &c., for an Indian dearly loves to be baptised, that is, he likes the attending feast and having god-fathers on